UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,195	08/29/2000	Feng-Jong Edward Yang	F0255	8593

45114 7590 11/23/2004

HARRITY & SNYDER, LLP
11240 WAPLES MILL ROAD
SUITE 300
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER	
BATES, KEVIN T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/650,195	YANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Bates	2155	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
   NOTE: _____.
3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1-7,9-13 and 15-19*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the arguments to claim 1, the applicant argues that Springer does not disclose an external memory, thus not having a first and second external memory bus and that there is no motivation to combine the references. The examiner disagrees, corresponding to the combination of Hassell and Springer, Hassell discloses having one external memory with a data bus and a port for that bus, plus the teaching of Springer which is an improved way of handling addressing memory, which is having separate memory modules which have different datapaths or databuses that can be addressed separately. The combination leads to improve Hassell's external memory by having separate external memory modules that can be addresses and accesses separately by having separate datapaths, or in this case data buses. There is also motivation to make the combination because Spinger allows two memory modules to work as a signal large memory unit, allowing parallel writes, while also working as two separate memory modules allowing separate accesses to each (Column 1, lines 63 - 65; Column 6, lines 54 -59)l

Regarding the argument to claim 10, the applicant argues that the combination of hassell and Springer does not disclose alternately transferring dataframe infromaiton from the first group of the received devices to the first and second memories and alternately transferring data frame information from a second group of the receive devices to the first and second memories. The examiner disagrees, as stated in response to the arguments in the final rejection mailed on September 3, 2004, that Hassell allows information to be received from a first receive device and a second receive device into an external memory. Springer's improvement to the external memory allows information to be entered into the first and second module of memory in a 16 bit format or 8 bit format, where the 8 bit format allows information to be addressed to a either memory module, but not the other. Thus the combination of Springer allows memory to be entered from the first group and be entered into both memories simultaneously (16 bit mode) or either memory module (8 bit mode). This allows the first group to address its information to any combination or either and both memory modules, which includes alternately sending data frames to both, and the same correspondes to the second receive device.

Regarding the argument to claim 11, the applicant argues that the combination of Hassell and Springer does not indicate the simultaneous transmitting of selection signals to the first and second receive devices. The examiner disagrees, Hassel discloses the selection of the outbound receive device based on an output queue pointer, then received the frame from external memory (Column 6, lines 63 - 67) and Sprinnger allows information to be pulled from modules separately, so having two modules and two receiving devices allows signals to be simultaneously to the memories, which allows signals to be sent to the receive devices simultaneously.

Regarding the argument to claim 16, the applicant argues that the combination does not generate selection signals for the receive devices and that the combination does not have a switching device. The examiner disagrees, the Hassell discloses sending pointers generated for identifiying locations of frames in the system to the receive devices, which works as a selection signal (Column 6, lines 63 - 67) and Springer uses the address as addressing to which module information is stored on, so it has a mux it is using as a switch device to help address where the information is to be stored (figure 1, elements 28 and 32).

Regarding claim 18, see the comments to the response to claim 10.

Regarding claim 2, the applicant argues that the combination of Hassell, Springer, and Gayton does not indicate simultaneously outputting selection singals to the receive devices. The examiner disagress, Gayton discloses operationg receive devices simultaneously and Hassel discloses sending selection signals to the receive devices for when actions need to be taken, so their combination equals simultaneously signalling and operating receive devices.